



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: 70 AMMISCE-NEER E-R PATENTS  
700 L'ATLIS  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09/833,117	04/12/2001	Craig A. Rosen	6832 0015.00	6455

22195 7890 08 26 2003  
HUMAN GENOME SCIENCES INC  
9410 KEY WEST AVENUE  
ROCKVILLE, MD 20850

EXAMINER
----------

ROBINSON, HOPE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1653	6

DATE MAILED 08 26 2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/833,117

Applicant(s)

ROSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Hope A. Robinson

Art Unit

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(c).

### Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2001.

2a)  This action is FINAL. 2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) 1-59 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121

### Attachment(s)

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other \_\_\_\_\_

***Restriction/Election***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-21, drawn to an albumin fusion protein comprising a therapeutic protein X (SEQ ID NO:) and albumin (SEQ ID NO: 18), classified in class 424, subclass 192.1.
  - II. Claims 22-25, drawn to a method of treating a disease or disorder in a patient using the fusion protein comprising therapeutic protein X, classified in class 514, subclass 12.
  - III. Claim 26, drawn to a method of extending the shelf life of Therapeutic protein X (SEQ ID NO:), classified in class 435, subclass 449.
  - IV. Claims 27-29, drawn to a nucleic acid molecule encoding an albumin fusion protein comprising a therapeutic protein X, classified in class 536, subclass 23.4.
  - V. Claims 30-50 and 59, drawn to an albumin fusion protein comprising IL-2, classified in class 424, subclass 192.1.
  - VI. Claims 51-54, drawn to a method of treating a disease or disorder in a patient using the fusion protein comprising IL-2, classified in class 514, subclass 12.
  - VII. Claims 55, drawn to a method of extending the shelf life of IL-2, classified in class 435, subclass 449.

VIII. Claims 56-58, drawn to a nucleic acid molecule encoding an albumin fusion protein comprising IL-2, classified in class 536, subclass 23.4.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using that product for example to make antibodies for assays.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using that product for example to make antibodies for assays.

The nucleic acids of Invention IV are related to the protein of Invention I by virtue of encoding same. The DNA molecule has utility for the recombinant production of the protein in a host cell, as recited in the claims of Invention IV. Although the DNA molecule and protein are related since the DNA encodes the specifically claimed protein, they are distinct inventions because the protein product can be made by

another and materially different process, such as by synthetic peptide synthesis or purification from the natural source. Further, the DNA may be used for processes other than the production of the protein, such as nucleic acid hybridization assay.

Inventions II and III are patentably distinct because the methods are directed to different method steps and end points.

Inventions IV and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using that product for example the product can be used in a hybridization assay.

Inventions IV and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using that product for example to make antibodies for assays.

Inventions V-VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different

product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using that product for example to make antibodies for assays.

Inventions V and VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product can be used in a materially different process of using that product for example to make antibodies for assays.

The nucleic acids of Invention VIII are related to the protein of Invention V by virtue of encoding same. The DNA molecule has utility for the recombinant production of the protein in a host cell, as recited in the claims of Invention VIII. Although the DNA molecule and protein are related since the DNA encodes the specifically claimed protein, they are distinct inventions because the protein product can be made by another and materially different process, such as by synthetic peptide synthesis or purification from the natural source. Further, the DNA may be used for processes other than the production of the protein, such as nucleic acid hybridization assay.

Inventions VI and VII are patentably distinct because the methods are directed to different method steps and end points.

The protein products of Inventions I and V are separate and distinct because they have different structures. The fusion partner of Invention I is a therapeutic protein X and the fusion partner of Invention II is IL-2.

The products of Inventions IV and VIII are patentably distinct because the DNAs encode different fusion protein that are structurally different.

The methods of Inventions II, III, VI and VII are separate and distinct because the methods use different products, have different method steps and end points.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Furthermore, the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as a separate subject for inventive effect and require independent searches. The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. A reference which would anticipate the invention of one group would not necessarily anticipate or make obvious the other group. Moreover, as to the question of burden of search, classification of subject matter is merely one indication of the burdensome nature of the search involved. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, election of a single group for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

2. A telephone call was made to Ms. Michele Wales on April 24, 2003 to request an oral election to the above requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(l).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope Robinson whose telephone number is (703) 308-6231. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 am to 6:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S. F. Low, can be reached at (703) 308-2923.

Any inquiries of a general nature relating to this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted by facsimile transmission. The official fax phone number for Technology Center 1600 is (703) 308-4242. Please affix the examiner's name on a cover sheet attached to your communication should you

choose to fax your response. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG (November 15, 1989).

Hope Robinson, MS   
Patent Examiner



CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1900